

Elaine Cardenas  
Library 710  
February 10, 2010

## **Recursion**

The quote you used about “Our failure to teach research as a recursive process may be, then, one decisive, if not *the* most decisive, element in unsuccessful literacy instruction” also resonated with me. I have to say, it never occurred to me to “teach” this concept. In my mind, I think of it as the phrase “back to the drawing board”. While I know I have used this phrase in my teaching when research wasn’t yielding results, I have never consciously taught students that this is part of the research process.

The notion of self-talk also intrigued me. “. . .sharing with the students a kind of cognitive self-talk, the ongoing monologue of discovery, testing, and analysis that accompanies the actions of the research process, helped them with their research.” (p. 142) Again, this is not a technique I’ve used consciously. I model for the students, but I haven’t consciously included this as part of my modeling.

The other point that caught my attention was: “Importance, potentially the greatest consistently positive force among the factors, may be increased by ensuring that the problem has significant interest to the researcher.” (p.145) This renewed my conviction to pursue and learn the process used in the ISearch, where students select their own research topics. In my TL observation last week, I mentioned some of the topics that the students at this particular school were researching. The sky was the limit. Their topics ranged from stealth technology to fast food to Italian food. We know as adults that we are more willing to spend time learning about that which interests us; why should that be any different for the students? It seems to me, if the students are in fact interested in the topic, then they won’t balk when the need for recursion arises. Hopefully their goal will be to obtain the information they are seeking as opposed to “finishing” the steps of the process.